



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,845	01/16/2004	Henry Gene Ramirez	FP-0402	6940
36088	7590	04/17/2009	EXAMINER	
KANG LIM			WEBER, JONATHAN C	
3494 CAMINO TASSAJARA ROAD #436				
DANVILLE, CA 94506			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10758845	1/16/2004	RAMIREZ ET AL.	FAS-003-US
EXAMINER			
Jonathan C. Weber			
ART UNIT			PAPER
3641			20090415

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner for Patents**

The supplemental appeal brief filed on 12 March 2009 is defective for the following reason(s): Reference characters/drawings not properly referenced for the elements in the claims. The summary of the claim must serve map the claimed structure to the specification and drawings so that the Board may quickly reference the specification and drawings for adequate support and interpretation of the claim. That is every claimed structure, such as the "free bore section", "shoulder section", etc must be mapped to the specification and drawings. Currently the summary is more directed to a summary of the invention and NOT the claimed subject matter.

Also, as noted previously, there are no amendments after final on this case. However applicant should indicate that the affidavits were entered in the advisory action.

The "Response to the Objection of the Specification" is a petitionable matter and not a proper issue before the Board.

The double patenting rejection is not listed as a ground of rejection to be reviewed upon appeal.

The time period for response continues to run from the mailing date of the last Notice of Defective Appeal Brief

/Michael J. Carone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3641